

standard magnetic strip reader 4, an optional bar code reader 4', a check reader 4'" (column 5, lines 15-17). The display means 6 displays a credit approval code or other information from a credit authorization agency (column 6, line 66 through column 7, line 14). The Examiner has failed to suggest a modification to the prior art, much less one suggested by the prior art, that teaches or suggests "a media player for reading digital data stored on said data storage medium; and a projection unit for displaying said digital data on the condition that said authorization code matches said identification code" as recited by Claim 1.

The Examiner has failed to present a prima facie case for obviousness of independent Claim 14. The Examiner has not made any attempt to read the teachings of the prior art on the limitations of independent Claim 14.

Claims 2-4, 6-13, 15-17, and 19-24 depend from Claims 1 or 14 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits. For example, Claim 13 recites "said media player having a first identification code; said projector having a second identification code; and said verification unit comprising a first verification unit in said media player and a second verification unit in said projector unit" The Examiner has not made any effort to read the prior art onto the limitations of Claims 4, 6-13, and 15-17.

Claims 5 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Houvener in view of Schuermann, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,469,363 to Saliga. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

For the reasons argued above with respect to Claims 1 and 14, Houvener in view of Schuermann does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of Claims 1 and 14, from which Claims 5 and 18 depend, much less the added features of Claims 5 and 18. With respect to Claims 5 and 18, the Examiner has failed to present a prima facie argument for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Not only does the Examiner fail to identify any teaching in the prior art of record that would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to make the modification suggested by the Examiner, but the modification suggested by the Examiner fails to read on the claims at issue.

The Examiner stated, "Saliga discloses an electronic tag with source certification 52 that is potted or sealed into a tamper-proof enclosure (see., abstract, col 3, lines 44-58)." The

relevant portion of the passage cited by the Examiner states, "the tag circuitry 52 is potted or sealed into a tamper-proof enclosure 56 to complete the manufacturing process. Once the tag 10 is sealed, the inductive coupling circuit 12 is the only means by which data can be loaded into or read from it." In contrast, Claims 5 and 18 each recite, "a media jukebox for opening a tamper-proof cartridge containing said data storage medium, and for accessing said data storage medium."

Claims 25-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being [anticipated] by Houvener. The applicant respectfully disagrees. In order to anticipate, each and every element of the Claim must be present in the prior art. The Examiner has failed to show a passage in Houvener that teaches "an identification system module corresponding to said digital storage medium, said identification system module containing an authorization code describing which media players are authorized to read digital data from said digital storage medium" as recited by Claim 25.

The Examiner has failed to attempt any reading of Houvener on the limitations of either independent Claims 31 and 38.

Claims 25-30, 32-37, and 39-42 depend from independent claims 25, 31, or 38 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits. The Examiner has not attempted to read the prior art on the limitations of Claims 25-30, 32-37, and 39-42.

In view of the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application, Claims 1-42, accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that Claims 1-42 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Brill
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265

(972) 917-4379
FAX: (972) 917-4418